

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,225,901 to Kail (Kail) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,492 to Nakamura (Nakamura).

Claim 1

Kail and Nakamura do not teach all elements of claim 1, even in combination. Specifically, Kail does not disclose transmitting a command to get a reportable specification to a sensor, or transmitting a reportable specification message from a sensor.

Kail teaches a reprogrammable remote sensor monitoring system. This monitoring system includes a central monitoring device 14, and a portable monitoring unit 12 that is connected to sensors 28 (Col. 4:11-41). When the portable monitoring unit 12 is powered up, its microprocessor initializes itself, and then begins to monitor the sensors 28 for activity (Col. 6:49-60). Subsequently, the microprocessor simply waits for sensor activity and, should any occur, sends the sensor data to the central monitoring device 14 (Col. 6:57-7:20).

It should be noted that the portable monitoring unit 12, once initialized, does not send any signals to the sensors 28. Instead, it simply waits for the sensors 28 to send data. Thus, Kail does not disclose transmitting a command to a sensor. Similarly, because the sensors 28 simply transmit data to the portable monitoring unit 12, Kail also does not disclose transmitting a reportable specification message from a sensor. The Examiner cited col. 6, line 49, to col. 7, line 59, and col. 7, line 60, to col. 8, line 57, for transmitting a command to get a reportable specification to a sensor. The applicant did not see anything in the cited passages that teach this. The Examiner failed to point out anything in Nakamura that teaches this. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not made obvious by Kail in view of Nakamura.

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kail in view of Nakamura in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,350 to Steen, III et al. (Steen) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,204,768 to Kosugi (Kosugi).

Claim 2

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1. Additionally, Kail, Nakamura, Steen and Kosugi do not teach all elements of claim 2, even in combination. Specifically, Kosugi does not disclose transmitting an acknowledgement of a reportable specification message.

Kosugi teaches a fire monitoring system and fire sensor in which a receiver 100 is in communication with sensors 102 (Col. 5:63-6:2). However, the receiver 100 never transmits an acknowledgement of a reportable specification message to the sensors 102. The only acknowledgement signal transmitted to the sensors 102 is sent in the context of mode-switching, not reportable specifications.

The sensors 102 of Kosugi can switch to any one of three different modes: smoke sensing mode, heat sensing mode, and multi-sensing mode (Col. 6:18-22). When it is desired to switch modes, a mode switch request is sent to the sensors 102 (Fig. 4; Col. 8:24-27). This request is acknowledged with an ACK response sent to the receiver 100 (Fig. 4; Col. 8:28-31), which then responds with a separate ACK response sent to the sensors 102 (Fig. 4; Col. 8:31-36). The ACK response sent to the sensors 102 simply triggers the sensors 102 to continue with the mode-switching process (Col. 8:37-38), and therefore is not a reportable specification message. Accordingly, Kosugi discloses transmitting an acknowledgement to continue mode-switching, and does not disclose transmitting an acknowledgement of a reportable specification message.

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kail in view of Nakamura in further view of Steen in further view of Kosugi in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,123 to Sandelman et al. (Sandelman).

Claim 3

Claim 3 depends from claim 2, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claims 1 and 2. Additionally, Kail, Nakamura, Steen, Kosugi, and Sandelman do not teach all elements of claim 3, even in combination. Specifically, Sandelman does not disclose transmitting an alarm table to a sensor. The cited section of Sandelman col. 3, lines 20-65, and col. 8, line 53, to col. 9, line 15 discloses providing an exception conduction, but does not disclose or suggest transmitting an alarm table. Page 8, lines 1-3, of the application states that the Alarm Table provides alarm identification numbers and a description of each

alarm. Sandelman does not teach sending such a table to a sensor. For at least these reasons, claim 3 is not made obvious by Kail, Nakamura, Steen, Kosugi, and Sandelman.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kail in view of Nakamura in further view of Steen in further view of Kosugi in further view of Sandelman in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,301,122 to Halpern (Halpern).

Claim 4

Claim 4 depends from claim 3, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claims 1-3. Additionally, Kail, Nakamura, Steen, Kosugi, Sandelman, and Halpern do not teach all elements of claim 4, even in combination. Specifically, Halpern does not disclose transmitting time and initialization data to a sensor.

Halpern discloses a measuring and monitoring system 2 comprising a host computer C1 that controls site processors P1-PN, each of which in turn controls sensors S1-SX (Fig. 1; Cols. 4:37-46, 11:35-49). Data from sensors S1-SX is sampled periodically according to time and date information sent from the host computer C1 to the site processors P1-PN (Col. 11:36-46; 4:43-46). The site processors P1-PN then poll the sensors S1-SX at the specified time and date (Col. 10:50-52).

It should be noted that, as only time and date information is sent to the site processors P1-PN, Halpern does not disclose the transmitting of time and initialization data. Even if time and date information is to be considered the same as time and initialization data, Halpern does not disclose transmitting this information to a sensor. Rather, time and date information is transmitted to a site processor P1-PN. These site processors P1-PN do not pass this information on to the sensors S1-SX. Rather, they simply take readings from the sensors. Accordingly, Halpern does not disclose the transmitting of time and initialization data, and even if it did, Halpern does not disclose transmitting this data to a sensor.

Claim 5

Claim 5 depends from claim 4, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claims 1-4. Additionally, Kail, Nakamura, Steen, Kosugi, Sandelman and Halpern do not teach all elements of claim 5, even in combination. Specifically, Halpern does not disclose transmitting a process related command to a sensor.

As above, Halpern discloses sending time and date information to site processors P1-PN, not to sensors S1-SX. Thus, Halpern does not disclose transmitting a process related command. Furthermore, because the time and date information is sent to processors P1-PN instead of sensors S1-SX, Halpern also does not disclose transmitting process related commands to a sensor.

Claims 6-9

Claim 6 depends from claim 5, claim 7 depends from claim 6, claim 8 depends from claim 7, and claim 9 depends from claim 8. Claims 6-9 are therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claims 1-5.

For at least these reasons, claims 4-9 are not made obvious by Kail, Nakamura, Steen, Kosugi, Sandelman and Halpern.

The Examiner stated that applicants' arguments were considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection. The Examiner makes no further effort to rebut the applicants' arguments. The applicants interpret this as a statement that applicants' arguments were sufficient in distinguishing the Examiner's rejection under the old grounds. Therefore, the applicants submit that where the present grounds for rejection are the same as the previous Official Action, the applicants have successfully distinguished the art.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael Lee
Reg. No. 31,486

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(831) 655-2300